

## Accreditation Study Work Group

### Topic, Issues and Options Matrix

#### I. Topics where the Accreditation Study Work Group has reached consensus on a recommendation to the COA

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
1) Purpose of Accreditation “Framework - Introduction to the Framework”	Refine the purpose of accreditation for California’s educator preparation programs, taking into consideration the policy and budget environment in California and nationally.  <i>Does the current purpose of the Accreditation system as contained in the introduction of the Accreditation Framework reflect the generally agreed upon purpose(s) of accreditation today?</i>	<del>Continue purposes as defined in Accreditation Framework</del>  Modify definition of purpose of accreditation *** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of accreditation: Ensure accountability; Adhere to standards; Ensure high quality and effective preparation programs; Support program improvement.</li> <li>• Essential Attributes: Description of the attributes of the implementation accreditation system: <i>Professional Nature; Knowledgeable participants; Breadth and flexibility; Intensity, Efficiency and cost-effectiveness.</i></li> </ul>
2) Role of CTC and COA  Framework: Sections 1 & 2  Handbook	The Commission’s vision statement is “To ensure that those who educate the children of this state are academically and professionally prepared.” One of the Commission’s goals is to: “Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.” The COA has responsibility for implementing the accreditation system, while the Commission establishes policies. The COA reports to the Commission on an annual basis.  <i>Do the roles and responsibilities of the Commission and COA under the current accreditation system provide appropriate oversight of teacher education and maximum efficiency?</i>	Continue the roles of the Commission and COA as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> but improve communication between COA and Commission by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) On-going COA representative reports at Commission meetings as appropriate, but more frequently than annual reporting. COA will investigate and implement processes that will allow the Commission to better determine how its accreditation policies are being implemented.***</li> <li><del>b) COA information or consent item on the agenda at each Commission meeting, or as appropriate</del></li> </ul> <del>Modify the role of the Commission in accreditation</del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>e) Commission ratification of accreditation decisions made by COA</del></li> <li><del>d) Eliminate COA, Commission makes all accreditation decisions</del></li> <li><del>e) COA initially accredits institutions instead of the Commission</del></li> </ul>

# I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
3) Unit Accreditation and Program Approval Framework: Section 5	Currently California's accreditation system involves a single accreditation decision for the institution—unit accreditation. The individual programs are approved within the process of coming to the institution's accreditation decision.  <i>Does the current system need to be modified to ensure appropriate attention to both program and unit issues?</i>	<del>Continue to accredit the institution with program approval embedded in the single accreditation process.</del>
		<del>Move back to a program approval system without any institution wide accreditation decision</del>
		Develop a new system that addresses both unit accreditation AND enhanced program review in a different manner. (For more information on this proposed system, see pages 2-7 of this matrix.) ***
4) Accreditation as a single event or an on-going activity Framework: Section 5	Currently the accreditation system examines an institution every six years with a 'snapshot.' The COA decides on an accreditation finding and if that finding is Accreditation, the institution does not interact with the COA until the next review in six years.  <i>Would an approach that allows historical data to be considered better support the purposes of an accreditation system?</i>	<del>Maintain the current system with the snapshot approach</del>
		Modify the system to reflect the fact that accreditation is an on-going activity. Accreditation should be viewed as an on-going cycle of activities focused on accountability, meeting the standards, and data driven decision making. The prior accreditation report and continuing data reports are considered in the accreditation system. ***
5) Accreditation Decisions Framework: Section 5	Current Framework includes three options—Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, and Denial of Accreditation. Current Framework also requires all Stipulations to be cleared within one year.  <i>Does this menu of options or the time frame for follow-up need to be modified in any way?</i>	<del>Continue with the current accreditation options as described in the Accreditation Framework</del>
		Modify the Accreditation Framework to more clearly show individual program findings. Program Standard findings on standards will include Standard Met, Met with Concerns, Met Minimally, and Not Met. Revise the Unit Accreditation findings to include the finding of full accreditation for the educational unit with required follow-up. ***

# I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
6) National Unit Accreditation Framework: Section 7	Current law states that national accreditation of an educational unit may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California.  <i>How or should national accreditation of the education unit integrate with state accreditation?</i>	Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i> : Agreements and protocols with national accrediting bodies may need to be adjusted to accommodate the revised state accreditation system.***
		<del>Replace California's accreditation process with national accreditation</del>
		<del>Eliminate national accreditation options</del>
		<del>Modify existing practice...</del>
7) National Program Approval or Accreditation Framework: Section 7	Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California.  <i>How or should national accreditation of individual preparation programs integrate with state accreditation?</i>	<del>Continue national program accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i>, no change required</del>
		<del>Replace California's program approval process with national program accreditation or approval</del>
		<del>Eliminate national program options</del>
		All California programs must participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation when the national program review can be coordinated with the California process*** (National organizations may do the preliminary work of determining alignment of national standards to California standards, but COA will review all standards for comparability.)
8) Program Standard Options Framework: Section 3	Currently, there are five program standard options that institutions may choose among: California Standards, National or Professional Standards, General Standards, Experimental Standards, or Alternative Standards.  <i>Do each of the five current options provide equivalent or adequate standards for accreditation activities? Should the options be modified or changed?</i>	<del>Continue with the current five program standard options</del>
		Provide three program standards options: 1) California Program Standards, 2) National or Professional Program Standards, or 3) Alternate Program Standards. These alternate standards include experimental or research based and alternative standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards. ***

# I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
		<del>Require all institutions to use 1) California or 2) National or Professional Program Standards</del>
		<del>Require all institutions to use California Program Standards only</del>
9) Evaluation of the Accreditation System Framework: Section 8	Currently Section 8 of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> defines how the accreditation system is evaluated and modified. Because the law required a one time, external evaluation of the system and that evaluation has taken place, much of the current Section 8 would not apply to a revised accreditation system.	Modify Section 8 of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> to define an ongoing data collection process regarding the efficacy of the accreditation system. Define how modifications will be made in the future and when stakeholder input is required.***
		<del>Leave Section 8 of the Accreditation Framework as it is currently</del>
10) Blended Programs Framework: Section 5	Blended Programs that are approved by the CTC have submitted a program document that satisfies the six Blended Program standards. The institution must also have an approved subject matter and teacher preparation program. In addition many institutions have unofficial blended or integrated programs that serve the early decider. <i>Should Blended Programs—approved programs—be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	<del>Continue the initial program approval process.</del>
		<del>Continue current initial program approval process but add on-going review through the accreditation system.</del>
		Include approved Blended programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. ***
11) Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Programs	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Multiple Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to help candidates develop subject matter competence. Prior to NCLB, completion of a subject matter program waived the examination requirement. Currently completion of a program does not waive the examination requirement.  <i>Should the Multiple Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some</i>	<del>Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review</del>
		Continue current initial program approval and in addition collect data every seven years from programs, but not include in the institution's accreditation decision. Periodic data (CSET scores-contingent on the availability of meaningful score reports, course matrix showing alignment with K-12 academic content standards) will support the program in focusing on the K-12 content standards and program improvement and could result in further review.***

# I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
	<i>other process?</i>	<del>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system.</del>
12) Single Subject- Subject Matter Programs	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Single Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to satisfy the subject matter requirement.  <i>Should the Single Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i>	<del>Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review</del>
		Continue current initial program approval and in addition collect data every seven years from programs but do not include in the institution's accreditation decision. Periodic data (course matrix showing alignment with the K-12 academic content standards, program evaluation data and an update on program changes) will support the program in focusing on the K-12 content standards and program improvement and could result in further review.***
		<del>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.*</del>
		<del>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system</del>
13) Selection of COA members  Framework: Section 2	The current selection process for COA members is cumbersome and costly.  <i>Can the selection process be simplified, still meet the requirements of the Education Code, and support the selection of quality COA members?</i>	<del>Keep current process with no modifications</del>
		Modify the selection process to reduce costs, prevent large turnover of COA members in the same year, streamline the nominating panel process.***
14)	Certificate programs (CLAD/BCLAD, Early Childhood for example) have not previously been a part of the accreditation	<del>Continue to approve certificate programs with no on-going program approval</del>

# I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Certificate Programs Framework: Section 5	system, although Reading certificate is now a part of accreditation. <i>Should all the certificate programs be reviewed through the accreditation system process?</i>	Review CTC approved certificate programs through the accreditation system in addition to the original program approval process.***
15) Designated Subjects Programs Framework: Section 5	Institutions of higher education and local education agencies may both offer designated subjects credential programs. Both types of programs are initially reviewed by a panel for initial program approval. Currently, only the IHE programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. <i>Should LEA sponsored designated subjects programs be reviewed through the accreditation system?</i>	<del>Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Only the IHE sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system.</del> Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Both IHE and LEA sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. ***
16) Site Level Activity— Scope and Structure Framework: Section 5	The current site visit reviews all standards—unit and program—through document review, interviews and a self-study at the institution.  <i>What should take place during the site level activity? Could the site level activity benefit from increased use of technology?</i>	<del>Continue with the current site visit as defined in the Accreditation Framework where both unit and program standards are examined.</del> Move to a “focused site visit” that reviews only some standards or some programs. Review the unit through a site visit. Review all programs through biennial data collection and once per cycle document review prior to site activity. Program issues identified during the biennial report and document review can also be addressed during the site review.***
17)	Currently, institutions have a site visit every six years. (NCATE has moved to a seven year cycle with additional	<del>Continue with the six year cycle as defined in the Accreditation Framework</del>

# I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Site Level Activity-Frequency Framework: Section 5	interim reporting mechanisms required.)  <i>What is the appropriate cycle for the future site level activity?</i>	Move to a seven year cycle but with biennial data collection and an interim activity in the fourth year of the cycle. Develop a plan for immediate intervention if warranted.***
18) Interim Review Activities Framework: Section 5	Information was shared from the BTSA community on the informal peer review process which takes place in between the formal review site visits. The value of these activities for program improvement was emphasized. How can the accreditation system support ongoing program improvement?  <i>What type of interim activities—unit or program focused—would support program improvement?</i>	<del>Standards based review process that takes place in the interval between the site visits. The process could be focused on the unit or the programs, there are options for institutions, and the activity is required.**</del> Biennial report*** <del>No interim review activity</del>
19) Specialized Credential Programs Framework: Section 5	In addition to Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, the Commission awards credentials in many specialized areas—Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services, Designated Subjects, and Intern credentials. <i>Should there be any modifications to the accreditation system to support the review of these programs?</i>	Include specialized credential programs in the revised system. Review specialized programs through the biennial report and 4 <sup>th</sup> year program review process.***
20) Use of Technology	Currently, the use of technology is not integrated into the accreditation system in any sort of systematic manner. <i>Would it be helpful to systematize and/or increase the use of technology in accreditation activities: annual reports, program documents, site visits, reports</i>	<del>Leave the use of technology (type and level of) to the individual institution.</del> Use technology to support the 1) biennial reports, 2) program documents, 3) site visits ***

# I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
21) 2042 Required Elements	Prior to SB 2042, the standards had “Factors to Consider” and the review teams were guided by the factors. The 2042 Standards (subject matter, teacher prep, induction and 5 <sup>th</sup> year) have “Required Elements” and the reviewers are asked to hold the institution accountable for every element. <i>A concern has been expressed that the ‘required elements’ may be too prescriptive and contrary to efforts to move towards an outcomes-based accreditation mode. Should the required elements aspect of the SB 2042 standards be reviewed and revised?</i>	Recommend that the Commission identify a small expert writing group to carefully examine the 2042 standards and evaluate and consider where changes are needed relative to the concept of ‘required elements’ versus ‘factors to consider.’ Product distributed for stakeholder review and feedback prior to adoption***
		<del>Recommend that the “Required Elements” in the SB 2042 Standards be revised to “Factors to Consider” in keeping with the attribute of flexibility in the accreditation system</del>
		<del>No change to the current system, maintain Required Elements</del>
22) Administrative Services Guideline based Programs	The current pathways to earn an Administrative Services Tier II credential include both standards based programs and guideline based programs (in addition, AB 75 programs are approved by the CDE). The approval and review process for the two types of programs differ. <i>Should both types of programs be approved and reviewed under the same process?</i>	<del>Continue to use the current two pathways to the Tier II credential with the two program approval and review processes.</del>
		Recommend that the Commission consider that both the Guidelines based programs and Standards based programs should be reviewed by the COA for ongoing approval.***
23) Experi- mental Program Standards	An institution may submit a program designed to meet the Experimental Program standards. These standards were approved in 1988. <i>Should the Experimental Program Standards be reviewed and revised?</i>	<del>Continue to use the currently approved Experimental Program Standards</del>
		Recommend that the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the Experimental Program Standards ***
24)	Currently, the process of submitting a program document and completing the review process is viewed as an arduous task.	Recommend that the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the subject matter approval process. ***



# I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Subject Matter Programs	<i>Should subject matter programs be reviewed in a different manner that streamlines the process but still ensures program quality? Should university majors be sufficient to satisfy subject matter requirements instead of an approved program? Is there a way to facilitate candidate's satisfaction of subject matter requirements in fields such as math and science where there is a critical need for teachers?</i>	Recommend that the Commission convene a group to review and make recommendations on 1) the use of a university degree as satisfaction of subject matter and 2) the critical need for teachers in specific fields, e.g. math and science, and if subject matter requirements should be modified.*
25) Blended Program Standards	There are currently six program standards that all approved blended programs are required to meet. An institution that wants to offer an approved blended program must have both an approved subject matter program and an approved teacher preparation program. Then the institution would submit an additional document that addresses the Blended Standards. The blended document is reviewed by readers, possibly readers that have not reviewed both the subject matter and the teacher preparation documents.  <i>Should the elements of the six Blended Program Standards be integrated within the preparation program standards and the blended program is viewed as a delivery mode or should the Blended Program Standards remain distinct with an additional approval process?</i>	<del>Continue to use the six Blended Program Standards as a separate set of standards that approved blended programs must submit to in addition to the subject matter and the teacher preparation standards.</del>  Infuse the requirements of the six Blended Program Standards into the specific program standards (MS, SS, and Ed Sp) so that if a program wants to offer a blended system of delivery (in a similar manner as the Intern program is a specific type of delivery system), then that program would address the blended standards within the basic program document. ***

## II. Topics needing additional discussion

### II. Topics where the Work Group has not yet reached consensus and would like to continue to work

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
26) Data Collection  Framework: Section 5	Annual, bi-annual, or periodic data collection on programs and/or the unit. Information gathered could be used to inform, and possibly structure, the site visit.  <i>What type of data should be collected and analyzed 1) during the site visit, and 2) in an interim activity, or annually? How should the data impact 1) the accreditation decision and 2) the focus of the site visit?</i>  <i>What data will provide information on candidate competence?</i>	<del>Goal for institution to aggregate data, systematically review the data and use the data for program improvement*</del>
		<del>Focus on candidate competence through pre and post test, TPA scores, employer survey, candidate self-assessment*</del>
		Each institution submits a biennial web based report particularly focused on a selected, specific standard area. For the initial cycles, this area will be candidate competence and related assessments. Periodically CTC can designate a different standard area to be the focus of the next designated time period, with appropriate notice to programs of the change. These reports are used by next site review team **
		<del>Use of surveys—program completers, employers, IHE faculty to gather appropriate information*</del>
27) 5 <sup>th</sup> Year Programs	Prior to SB 2042, the three Fifth Year courses were initially approved with no further review. The SB 2042 Fifth Year Programs are teacher preparation programs offered by institutions that have a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Preliminary Preparation Programs. One institution must recommend the candidate for the SB 2042 Professional Clear Credential as an alternative route to completion of induction. <i>Should 5<sup>th</sup> year programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	<del>Continue current initial program approval process with no further review</del>
		Include 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. Review should be equitable to the review process of Induction programs.**
		Include 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system as other programs. Review should be equitable to the review process of Induction programs.***
28) Induction Programs	There are currently 149 Commission approved BTSA Induction Programs. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process to review the BTSA programs on a four year cycle. Now Induction Programs are the preferred path to earn the Professional Clear Credential and there could in the future be induction programs	<del>Continue current initial program approval process and ongoing review with Formal Program Review with oversight by the BTSA Task Force for BTSA Induction programs.</del>
		Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. Review should be equitable to the review process of Fifth Year programs.**

## II. Topics needing additional discussion

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
	that are not BTSA programs. <i>Should Induction Programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Include BTSA Induction Programs in the accreditation system, BTSA Task Force coordinates the process, and the COA accredits the programs. Review should be equitable to the review process of Fifth Year programs.**
29) Specialized Credential Programs	In addition to Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, the Commission awards credentials in many specialized areas—Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services, Designated Subjects, and Intern credentials. <i>Should there be any modifications to the accreditation system to support the review of these programs?</i>	There are additional issues to consider related to specialized credential programs.**
30) BIR Training	The current BIR training was developed for the current accreditation system. If a new accreditation system is adopted, a new training must be developed	COA, with interested stakeholders, will develop a training process during 05-06 * CTC staff will propose revised content and process for new training. COA will review, gather feedback from the field (via web distribution and email), modify as necessary, and adopt.*
31) Composi- tion of Review Teams	Currently, site review team size varies greatly due to the size of the institution and the number of programs in operation at the institution. <i>What should guide the composition of the review team in a revised accreditation system?</i>	CTC staff will propose revised guidelines for review team composition. COA will review, gather feedback from the field (via web distribution and email), modify as necessary, and adopt.*
32) Selection of interviews and site visits	<i>How should sites and interviewees be selected to allow the review team to</i>	CTC staff will propose revised guidelines for selection of site interviews. COA will review, gather feedback from the field (via web distribution and email), modify as necessary, and adopt.*

## II. Topics needing additional discussion

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
33) Pre-conditions	Preconditions exist but are not coordinated, consistent or organized across all programs. <i>Should the Preconditions be reviewed and possibly made more consistent across all programs?</i>	Staff review, develop recommendations for COA agreement and then forward to Commission for approval.**
34) Common Standards	<i>Should the Common Standards be reviewed and possibly revised?</i> <i>Are there portions of the NCATE standards that could be incorporated into the Common Standards?</i>	Recommend that the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the Common Standards. **
35) “Triggers”	<i>When should an institution or program be asked to provide additional information to the COA? When should the COA schedule a focused site visit?</i>	Work group agenda

~~Strike out~~ Work group is no longer considering as an option  
7/8/2005

\*Work group is considering  
Questions in *italics* are designed to focus the discussion

\*\*Preliminary consensus \*\*\*Consensus!